

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-3, 6-12, 14-18 and 25-29 are now presented for examination, including original claims 2, 3, 7-9, 11, 15-18, and 23-24, amended claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 12, 14 and 22 and new claims 25-29. Claims 4, 13 and 19-21 have been cancelled. The Examiner has acknowledged that claims 6, 7, 10 and 11 are directed to allowable subject matter. These claims will not be discussed further in this amendment.

Claims 25-29 introduce other new and non-obvious features of the invention and do not introduce new matter. Claim 25 is a new independent claim for a communications system including a server for receiving video information and making the information accessible to a plurality of display sources. Claim 26 depends from claim 25 and classifies the video information into public and private information, the private information being accessible to only a select number of display sources. Claims 27 and 29 depend from amended claim 1 and claim 28 respectively and specify that the plurality of web cameras are directed to areas outside of vehicles. Claim 28 depends from claim 26 and further specifies that private video information is only accessible to display sources using an access code.

Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 12-14, 16, 19, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,147,598 to Murphy et al. (hereinafter Murphy

'598). For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejections are traversed.

The present invention is directed to a communications system and method incorporating a plurality of vehicle mounted web cams that collect video information and transmit the video information together with other local information via a wireless network to a server. The video streams from the web cams and associated information are available to users on an internet web page. Each camera has a specific identifier to permit users to access the video of specific individual cameras. Optimization software permits users to take virtual trips along predetermined routes. The system permits sequential access to multiple video feeds from desired locations. The system also permits a plurality of communication system users to access and display video information from the server.

Murphy '598 discloses a vehicle theft system that utilizes a handheld computing device. The computing device includes an image capture device, location determination system and a communication device. The handheld computing device can be located within a vehicle and an alarm system activated such that, upon the occurrence of an alarm triggering event, the image capture device captures images of the driver's compartment of the vehicle and the location determination system determines the location of the vehicle. The image capture device may use any of a number of known methods for capturing images such as video image recording methods.

With regard to amended claim 1, Murphy '598 fails to teach or suggest a communication system with a plurality of web cameras, each camera disposed in one of said vehicles, and means for transmitting information from the vehicles "wherein

transmitted information includes an identifier for each of the web cams" as required.

Rather, Murphy '598 discloses a single image capture device within a single vehicle theft system, the image capture device including no particular identifier.

The Examiner states that it is known in the art that if information is transferred from a device, (e.g. a camera in a vehicle) that an identifier may be the IP address necessary for sending information over the internet. Applicant respectfully does not agree. Although such an IP address is necessary to send information, such an identifier is not specific to the camera or other image capture device. Murphy '598 discloses transfer of location information, and an indication that the alarm has been triggered as well as image information, apparently, all through the same IP address. Applicant posits that the IP address is an identifier of the device transferring the information, not one of the multiple sources that provide that information. Thus, the identifier is unable to provide a way to distinguish between the alarm indication and image information described in Murphy '598. This problem is even more evident when applied to an embodiment of Applicant's invention wherein a vehicle includes multiple web cameras generating multiple sets of video information. The IP address provides no way to distinguish between cameras. Thus, Murphy '598 does not disclose or teach "an identifier for each of said web cams" as required.

Additionally, Murphy '598 fails to teach or suggest a server "providing a plurality of images for viewing by a plurality of communication system users" as required.

Rather, Murphy '598 teaches a hand held computing device that can transmit captured images to a designated remote location for identification. Further dissemination of the images via a server to a plurality of users is not disclosed or suggested.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is requested. With regard to claims 2 and 3, both claims depend directly or indirectly on claim 1 which is allowable for reasons brought forth in this amendment.

With regard to claim 5, which depends from claim 1 discussed above, Murphy '598 fails to teach or suggest a server that "is operable to display said identifier such that specific web cams may be selected by a user" as required. As stated above, Murphy '598 does not disclose multiple cameras, or camera specific identifiers. Further, the IP address indicated by the Examiner as being a camera specific identifier, due to its strictly numeric content, would not be an identifier that would allow a user to understand that a camera or specific camera was represented. Reconsideration and withdrawal of claim 5 is requested.

With regard to claims 8 and 9, both claims include the vehicle web cam identifier feature mentioned above with regard to claim 1. As stated above, Murphy '598 does not teach or suggest such an identifier. Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 8 and 9 is requested.

With regard to amended claim 12, Murphy '598 does not teach or suggest a plurality of web cams, "each disposed in a vehicle" and wherein video information from each of the web cams is transmitted to a server, collected and organized and displayed on a web page as required. Murphy '598 does not teach or suggest multiple web cams and more importantly does not teach or suggest collecting and organizing information from multiple web cams and displaying the information on a web page. Rather, Murphy '598 discloses transmission of images or video from a single source in combination with, at most, vehicle location data. There is no suggestion that the information

obtained from the web cams disclosed by Murphy '598 (images of car thieves) would be desirable to combine with any other type of *web cam* information. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 is requested.

Claim 14 depends directly on claim 12 which is allowable for reasons brought forth in this amendment.

With regard to claim 16, Murphy '598 fails to disclose a step "permitting a user to search for a desired individual identifier such that video information from the web cam having said individual identifier is displayed" as required. Rather, as stated above Murphy '598 does not disclose multiple cameras, or camera specific identifiers. Further, the IP address indicated by the Examiner as being a camera specific identifier, due to its strictly numeric content, would not be an identifier that would allow a user to understand which camera was represented and, thus, would not allow a user to perform a search for individual web cams. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14 and 16 is requested.

Claims 15, 17, 18, and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy '598 in view of U.S. Patent 6,675,386 to Hendricks et al. (hereinafter Hendricks '386). For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejections are traversed.

Hendricks '386 is directed to a method and apparatus for communicating multiple live video feeds over the internet. Users are able to remotely control a video picture of a distant location. Text, graphics, and other video information may supplement one or more video pictures to provide an educational and entertaining system.

The Examiner notes that one would have been motivated to combine teachings

of Murphy '598 (as applied to claim 14) with those of Hendricks '386, because of statements made at column 12, lines 1-17 in Murphy '598, in order to teach the additional features of claims 15, 17, 18, 22, 23 and 24 that depend directly or indirectly from claim 14. These statements in Murphy '598 note that images of the vehicle in different situations (car-jacking, crash) can assist local police or fire crews in providing efficient response. However, there is no suggestion that multiple web cams are needed or would be desirable to obtain these images. A single camera is sufficient. Thus, the teachings of Hendricks '386 regarding multiple web cams and selecting between them are not properly combinable with Murphy '598. The present application provides the only motivation for the combination. The Examiner's combination is invalid for hindsight. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15 and 22-24 is respectfully requested.

Additionally, with regard to claims 17 and 18, even if the references were combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the present invention would not result. Further modification of the combination would be required to arrive at the claimed invention. Neither reference teaches or suggests searching through video information "to identify vehicles in a desired geographic location" (as required by claim 17) or "to identify vehicles in a desired range of geographic locations" (as required by claim 18). Rather, Murphy '598 discloses determining the location of a vehicle (not by video means) after it has been stolen and Hendricks '386 discloses utilizing stationary cameras in different geographic locations. Neither reference addresses monitoring traffic situations (congestion, accidents) or previewing sights on a vehicular journey by identifying vehicles in a desired geographic location. Further modification of the

references alone or in combination would be required to arrive at the claimed invention.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17 and 18 is requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. HRA-12428.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK LLP

By 
James A. Balazs, Reg. No. 47401

4080 Erie Street
Willoughby, Ohio 44094
(216) 566-9700